



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Paper No. 35

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER, 8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

COPY MAILED

SEP 25 2001

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

ON PETITION

In re Application of
Steven C. Quay
Application No. 08/896,821
Filed: July 18, 1997
Attorney Docket No. 21020012140

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed August 8, 2001, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action mailed September 18, 2000, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on December 19, 2000.

An extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum extendable period for reply. See In re Application of S., 8 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Comm'r Pats. 1988). Accordingly, since the \$890 extension of time submitted on March 26, 2001 was subsequent to the maximum extendable period for reply, this fee is unnecessary and will be credited to petitioner's deposit account.

37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. If the statement contained in the instant petition varies from the language required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3), the statement contained in the instant petition is being construed as the statement required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) and petitioner must notify the Office if this is **not** a correct interpretation of the statement contained in the instant petition.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Irvin Dingle at (703) 306-5684.

The application file is being forwarded to Technology Center 1600 for further processing.



Irvin Dingle

Petitions Examiner

Office of Petitions

Office of the Deputy Commissioner

for Patent Examination Policy

BEST AVAILABLE COPY